

Table S3 Analyses of primary outcomes

First author (year)	Statistical test	Effect measure	Primary outcome(s) ¹	Effect size	Adjustment factors
Abramsky (2014) [6]	ANOVA	Risk ratio (95% CI)	IPV: Physical violence in past year IPV: Sexual violence in past year	0.48 (0.16-1.39) 0.76 (0.33-1.72)	Age, marital status, baseline area-level prevalence of IPV, community-pair
Ahmed (2005) [24]	Logistic regression	Odds ratio (95% CI)	IPV: Physical or psychological violence in past 4 months	Eligible non-member: 1.00 Passive member (savings): 1.36 (0.79-2.36) Active member (savings + credit): 1.47 (0.93-2.33) Skilled member (savings + credit + training): 0.64 (0.25-1.66)	Age, schooling, contribution to household income, currently-alive children, age of household head, schooling of household head, household poverty status
Bobonis (2013) [25]	OLS regression	Odds ratio, ³ <i>p</i> -value	IPV: Physical or sexual violence in past 12 months IPV: Physical violence in past 12 months IPV: Psychological violence in past 12 months IPV: Threats of physical violence in past 12 months IPV: Sexual violence in past 12 months	0.921, <i>p</i> <0.1 0.946, <i>p</i> <0.1 1.027, <i>p</i> >0.1 1.018, <i>p</i> >0.1 0.951, <i>p</i> >0.1	Woman and partner's age, woman and partner's indigenous status, woman's schooling, partner's schooling, household size, cohabitating couple indicator, years in union, spousal abuse exposure during childhood, individual control interaction terms, individual control polynomial terms, village fixed effects
Das (2012) [26]	OLS regression	Odds ratio, ³ <i>p</i> -value	Women's role/autonomy Gender roles Domestic work Masculinity Sexuality Knowledge of women/child laws Women do	Activist: 20.29, <i>p</i> =0.000 Influenced: 9.68, <i>p</i> =0.000 Activist: 132.95, <i>p</i> =0.000 Influenced: 24.29, <i>p</i> =0.000 Activist: 2.46, <i>p</i> =0.000 Influenced: 1.90, <i>p</i> =0.000 Activist: 26.31, <i>p</i> =0.000 Influenced: 6.89, <i>p</i> =0.000 Activist: 12.30, <i>p</i> =0.000 Influenced: 4.18, <i>p</i> =0.000 Activist: 3.13, <i>p</i> =0.002 Influenced: 0.83, <i>p</i> =0.532 Activist: 0.06, <i>p</i> =0.000	Age, education, caste, marital status, family structure, religion, occupation

			“traditional women’s work”	Influenced: 0.21, $p=0.000$	
			Men do “traditional male work”	Activist: 0.08, $p=0.000$ Influenced: 0.24, $p=0.000$	
Green (2015) [27]	OLS regression	Odds ratio ³ (95% CI), p -value	IPV: Physical or psychological violence in past 8 months IPV: Marital control in past 8 months	Trial 1 (WINGS v. control): 1.02 (0.90-1.15), $p>0.1$ Trial 2 (W+ v. WINGS): 1.01 (0.87-1.17), $p>0.1$ Trial 1 (WINGS v. control): 1.15 (1.01-1.31), $p<0.05$ Trial 2 (W+ v. WINGS): 0.99 (0.83-1.19), $p>0.1$	District fixed effect, road distances between villages, 90 baseline and midline covariates
Gupta (2013) [28]	GMM (4-level random intercepts model)	Odds ratio (95% CI), p -value	IPV: Physical or sexual violence in past year IPV: Physical violence in past year IPV: Sexual violence in past year IPV: Economic abuse in past year	0.92 (0.58-1.47), $p=0.72$ 0.69 (0.39-1.21), $p=0.19$ 0.71 (0.40-1.25), $p=0.24$ 0.39 (0.25-0.60), $p<0.0001$	Cluster
Hidrobo (2013) [29]	Linear probability model	Odds ratio, ³ p -value	IPV: Physical violence in lifetime IPV: Psychological violence (phrased in the present) IPV: Controlling behaviors (phrased in the present)	0.98, $p>0.1$ 0.98, $p>0.1$ 0.94, $p<0.05$	Woman’s age, years of schooling, race (Afro-Ecuadorian or indigenous), marital status, partner’s years of schooling, history of child death, current pregnancy, number of children 0-5 years old, urban indicator, use of kitchen for sleeping, asset index, asset index squared
Hossain (2014) [30]	Unpaired t-test	Risk ratio (95% CI)	IPV: Physical or sexual violence in past 12 months	0.52 (0.18-1.51)	Age group, cohabitation status, literacy, traumatic

			<p>IPV: More than one act of physical violence or at least one severe act in past 12 months</p> <p>IPV: Sexual violence in past 12 months</p>	<p>0.64 (0.24-1.73)</p> <p>0.50 (0.14-1.80)</p>	<p>experiences, baseline outcome level, village-pair</p>
Jewkes (2008) [31]	GLMM/GEE	Odds ratio (95% CI), <i>p</i> -value	<p>IPV: More than 1 incident of physical or sexual violence since last interview (in past 12 months)</p>	<p>Women (receipt)</p> <p>12 months: 0.87 (0.64-1.18), <i>p</i>=0.36</p> <p>24 months: 1.14 (0.77-1.68), <i>p</i>=0.51</p> <p>Men (perpetration)</p> <p>12 months: 0.73 (0.50-1.06), <i>p</i>=0.099</p> <p>24 months: 0.62 (0.38-1.01), <i>p</i>=0.054</p>	<p>Geographic stratum, age, time since last visit</p>
Jewkes (2014) [32]	Random effects regression	Model determined trend, <i>p</i> -value	<p>IPV: Physical or sexual violence in last 3 months</p> <p>IPV: Physical violence in last 3 months</p> <p>IPV: Sexual violence in last 3 months</p>	<p>Women (receipt) at baseline, 2 weeks, 28 weeks, and 52 weeks: 30.3, 25.7, 27.4, 18.9, <i>p</i>=0.037</p> <p>Men (perpetration) at baseline, 2 weeks, 28 weeks, and 52 weeks: 23.9, 25.3, 26.0, 21.9, <i>p</i>=0.86</p> <p>Women (receipt) at baseline, 2 weeks, 28 weeks, and 52 weeks: 27.9, 18.3, 25.6, 18.0, <i>p</i>=0.12</p> <p>Men (perpetration) at baseline, 2 weeks, 28 weeks, and 52 weeks: 16.5, 16.5, 17.3, 12.5, <i>p</i>=0.49</p> <p>Women (receipt) at baseline, 2 weeks, 28 weeks, and 52 weeks: 9.8, 12.5, 7.7, 3.6, <i>p</i>=0.033</p> <p>Men (perpetration) at baseline, 2 weeks, 28 weeks, and 52 weeks: 14.7, 16.5, 12.5, 13.5, <i>p</i>=0.69</p>	<p>None</p>
Kim (2007) [33]	Logistic regression	Risk ratio (95% CI)	<p>IPV: Physical or sexual violence in past year</p> <p>IPV: Controlling behavior in past year</p>	<p>0.45 (0.23-0.91)</p> <p>0.80 (0.35-1.83)</p>	<p>Age, village pair, marital status (only IPV and attitude measures), baseline measure, lifetime experience of IPV by current partner at baseline (only IPV measure)</p>

Kim (2009) [34]	ANOVA and logistic regression	Risk ratio (95% CI)	IPV: Physical or sexual violence in past year IPV: Controlling behavior in past year	MF ^d v. control: 0.86 (0.22-3.36) IMAGE v. control: 0.51 (0.28-0.93) IMAGE v. MF: 0.59 (0.09-3.66) MF v. control: 1.18 (0.77-1.80) IMAGE v. control: 0.84 (0.38-1.87) IMAGE v. MF: 0.69 (0.35-1.36)	Age group, village triplet, marital status (only attitude measure, others restricted to currently partnered women), education, parity, sex of household head
Kyegombe (2014) [35]	Geometric mean prevalence ratio (statistical test unspecified)	Risk ratio (95% CI)	IPV: Sexual violence in past year	0.81 (0.31-2.10)	Age, marital status, baseline area-level prevalence of the outcome, community-pair
Miller (2014) [36]	Linear mixed-effects regression	Between-group comparison on change score (95% CI), <i>p</i> -value	Gender attitudes Attitudes disapproving of violence against women	0.28 (0.12-0.43), <i>p</i> =0.001 0.04 (-0.31-0.39), <i>p</i> =0.82	Age group, religion, school
Pronyk (2006) [37]	Logistic regression	Risk ratio (95% CI)	IPV: Physical or sexual violence in past year IPV: Controlling behavior in past year	0.45 (0.23-0.91) 0.80 (0.35-1.83)	Age, village pair, marital status (IPV and attitudes measure only), baseline measure, lifetime experience of IPV by current partner at baseline (IPV measure only)
Pronyk (2008) [38]	Logistic regression	Risk ratio (95% CI)	More participation in social groups Belief in community support towards common goals Greater perception of community solidarity in a time of crisis Taken part in collective action	1.85 (0.95-3.61) 1.11 (0.38-3.24) 1.65 (0.81-3.37) 2.06 (0.92-4.49)	Age, village pair, marital status, baseline measure

Pulerwitz (2015) [39]	Chi-square test or bivariate regression	Not reported, <i>p</i> -value	<p>IPV: Physical or psychological violence in past 3 months</p> <p>IPV: Physical violence in past 3 months (perpetration)</p> <p>IPV: Psychological violence in past 3 months (perpetration)</p>	<p>Workers at baseline v. follow-up: 25.00 v. 10.94, <i>p</i><0.05</p> <p>Students at baseline v. follow-up: 10.61 v. 3.16, <i>p</i><0.05</p> <p>Workers at baseline v. follow-up: 19.23 v. 10.94, <i>p</i>>0.05</p> <p>Students at baseline v. follow-up: 7.58 v. 3.16, <i>p</i>>0.05</p> <p>Workers at baseline v. follow-up: 11.54 v. 1.56, <i>p</i><0.05</p> <p>Students at baseline v. follow-up: 5.30 v. 1.58, <i>p</i><0.05</p>	None
Pulerwitz (2015) [40]	GEE	Odds ratio, <i>p</i> -value	<p>IPV: Physical or sexual violence in the last 6 months (perpetration)</p> <p>IPV: Physical, sexual, or psychological violence in the last 6 months (perpetration)</p>	<p>GE+CE⁵ v. control: 60% less likely, <i>p</i>-value not given</p> <p>CE v. control: 60% less likely, <i>p</i>-value not given</p> <p>GE+CE v. control: 55% less likely, <i>p</i>-value not given</p> <p>CE v. control: 65% less likely, <i>p</i>=0.06</p>	Age, GEM Scale score, time, time by intervention group
Usdin (2005) [41]	Logistic regression	<p>Baseline to follow-up: percent difference, <i>p</i>-value⁶</p> <p>Follow-up by exposure: within column percentages⁶</p>	<p>Knowledge and awareness</p> <p>Personal attitudes</p> <p>Subjective norms</p> <p>Behaviors</p>	<p>Baseline to follow-up: 14% increase, <i>p</i>≤0.05</p> <p>By exposure at follow-up: 4-61%⁷</p> <p>Baseline to follow-up: non-significant to 18% increase⁷, <i>p</i>≤0.05</p> <p>By exposure at follow-up: 58-97%⁷</p> <p>Baseline to follow-up: 18-59% increase⁷, <i>p</i>≤0.05</p> <p>By exposure at follow-up: no association to 90%⁷</p> <p>Baseline to follow-up: not measured at baseline</p> <p>By exposure at follow-up: 0-62%⁷</p>	<p>Baseline to follow-up: area (urban or rural), age, sex, race, education, employment status, general media exposure</p> <p>Follow-up by exposure: area (urban or rural), age, sex, race, education, employment status, general media exposure</p>
Wagman (2015) [42]	Modified Poisson multivariate regression	Prevalence risk ratios (95% CI)	<p>IPV: Physical violence in past year</p> <p>IPV: Sexual violence in past year</p>	<p>Women (receipt)</p> <p>16 months: 0.97 (0.85-1.11)</p> <p>35 months: 0.79 (0.67-0.92)</p> <p>Men (perpetration)</p> <p>16 months: 0.80 (0.64-1.00)</p> <p>35 months: 1.00 (0.77-1.30)</p> <p>Women (receipt)</p> <p>16 months: 1.12 (0.96-1.31)</p> <p>35 months: 0.80 (0.67-0.97)</p>	Age, education, marital status, baseline experience of IPV experience (women) or perpetration (men)

	Men (perpetration)
	16 months: 0.90 (0.63-1.28)
	35 months: 0.81 (0.52-1.26)
IPV:	Women (receipt)
Psychological	16 months: 1.02 (0.92-1.14)
violence in	35 months: 0.91 (0.79-1.04)
past year	Men (perpetration)
	16 months: 0.88 (0.78-0.98)
	35 months: 0.99 (0.85-1.16)

¹Psychological IPV includes violence classified as psychological, emotional, and verbal by authors.

²Questions classified as psychological violence included controlling behaviors.

³We transformed reported beta-coefficients into odds ratios to increase comparability of effect sizes.

⁴MF = microfinance only intervention

⁵GE = group education, CE = community engagement

⁶Some measures were restricted to specific audiences (i.e., national, urban, or rural audiences or women) or specific media exposures (i.e., exposure to three media sources or high exposure to television, radio, or print media).

⁷The reported range is the smallest and largest percentage for all indicators in the stated category.